

Humanist

World Digest

VOL. 24, No. 3
AUGUST, 1952

1011 Heinz Avenue
BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA

COPY 25c
\$1.00 A YEAR

THE ORDINARY MAN AND TODAY'S EXTRAORDINARY TASK

By Rev. Laurance L. Cross, Mayor of Berkeley

Stevenson Defends Bill of Rights In Vetoing Illinois Broyles Bill

RELIGION vs. PHILOSOPHY

Young Men's League of Human Fellowship (Japan)

A NEW AUTHORITARIANISM

By Norman Thomas

News and Views • Letters to the Editor

THE IDEAL OF HUMANISM

We are seeking to present Humanism as a religious philosophy which denies no particular faith, but which provides a path over which all people can travel toward a unity that rises above the barriers of the beliefs which divide them. In behalf of this common faith, we emphasize a constructive approach rather than opposition to traditional philosophies.

TEN AIMS OF HUMANIST (World) FELLOWSHIP

- 1—Full endorsement of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights approved by the General Assembly of the United Nations at the Plenary meeting December 10, 1948, and world-wide implementation and fulfilment of those rights at the earliest possible moment.
- 2—The use of science to serve society, creatively, constructively, and altruistically in the preservation of life, the production of abundance of goods and services, and the promotion of health and happiness.
- 3—The establishment and furthering of scientific integral education in all schools and colleges so as to emancipate all peoples from the thrall of ignorance, superstition, prejudices and myths which impede individual development and forestall social progress.
- 4—The widest promotion of the creative arts so as to release all potential artistic abilities and raise the general level of artistic appreciation.
- 5—The increase of social, recreational and travel activities in order to broaden the outlook and improve the intercultural understanding among all peoples.
- 6—A quickened conservation of the world's natural resources, including human resources, so as to arrest their wasteful exhaustion and wanton destruction and thus insure their longest preservation and widest beneficial use for man's survival on this planet.
- 7—The inauguration of a world-wide economy of abundance through national economic planning and international economic cooperation so as to provide a shared plenty for all peoples.
- 8—The advancement of the good life on the basis of a morality determined by historical human experience and contemporary scientific research.
- 9—The development of a coordinated private, cooperative and public medical program which will provide preventive as well as curative medicine and include adequate public health education and personal health counseling.
- 10—The expansion of United Nations functions (1) to include international police power with sufficient armed forces to prevent war and (2) international economic controls capable of preventing world-wide monopolies and/or cartels.

HUMANIST WORLD DIGEST

(Successor to WELCOME NEWS)

A Quarterly of Liberal Religion

Anga Bjornson, Editor. Editorial Associates: Franz Wertgen, Felix J. Frazer, Victor Yarros. Entered as Second-Class matter at the Post Office at Berkeley, California, under the act of March 3, 1879. Publication Committee: Anga Bjornson, chairman; Edward L. Ericson, vice-chairman; John Morris and E. O. Corson, Business Manager. Subscription Rate: \$1.00 per year: Advertising Rates: As space is available, classified ads are 10c a word. Address to Business Manager. Vol. 24, No. 3, July, Aug., Sept., 1952. All rights reserved. The Humanist World Digest, 1011 Heinz Ave., Berkeley, Calif.

The responsibility of signed articles in this magazine is accepted by the writers and does not necessarily reflect the views of the Humanist World Digest. Permission granted for reproduction of original articles when proper credit is given.

EDITORIALS

WHICH WAY FREEDOM ROAD?

When Associate Justice William O. Douglas wrote "Frightened America" he sensed fully the most dangerous of all elements in a democracy—fear, fear of new ideas and new approaches and tolerance only of the old ideas. "Fear has mounted, fear of losing one's job, fear of being investigated, fear of being pilloried," says William O. Douglas, and "repression of ideas has taken the place of debate."

The heritage of America is based on the ideas expressed in our Bill of Rights where freedom of expression and protection against tyranny are basic concepts, and they were placed in our Constitution by our founding fathers in order that legislative bodies, whether Congress or State legislatures, when swayed by emotions of hate and prejudice as the aftermath of war or depressions, could not force through their bodies legislation by the force of tyrannical majorities. Lincoln's idea that minorities have rights is a fundamental idea. No democracy can endure when intolerant legislation forces minorities to rebel against fear and injustice.

Thomas Jefferson, still the greatest political philosopher in our history, sensed fully the meaning of this when he said, "People have common sense; they will make mistakes, but they will right them." If we did not believe in this idea fully, we would have to resort to a government by dictatorships instead of a government by ballot and public opinion.

But each generation has to fight its own battle of liberty as Jefferson again contended, and we today are forced to fight that battle against the old tyranny as expressed in a repetition of the ideas contained in the Alien and Sedition Acts passed in John Adams' administration.

Today they take the form of dangerous loyalty oaths, the technique used by Stalin and Hitler. In California these ideas will be perpetuated in the Constitution itself, if constitutional amendments 5 and 6 are not voted down by the people of California on November 4.

No finer statement on basic American liberties have been written in our generation than the one by Gov. Adlai Stevenson when he vetoed the Broyles Bill, passed by the Illinois State Legislature in the Senate by a vote of 35 to 15, and in the Assembly by 87 to 15. This veto is printed elsewhere in the magazine because it expresses in unexcelled language and reasoning our Civil Rights based on our personal liberties in our own day. A.B.

THE WORLD CALDRON

The trouble spots of the world are a seething caldron with too little arable land to support the high birth rates of their peoples, such as China, Korea, the East Indies, the Philippines, India, and country after country that you can name by just looking at continent after continent on the world map.

Full credit must be given Point 4 and its ameliorization of hunger and want and its introduction of better and scientific methods of food production in many of the over-populated nations outside the totalitarian areas. However, it is little use to overemphasize Point 4 unless at the same time something is done about the murderous birth rate of these population strangled countries whose people are moving like swarms of locusts, destroying their lands and resources as they expand.

As an example let's look at Korea, a land about the size of our state of Kansas, which is practically all arable land and has a population of nearly one million, while Korea has around 30 million people and only 25% of its land arable. The stabilizing economics of such over-populated countries is going to be a difficult, if not an impossible, task without first the democratic stabilization of their population at a point where their lands and natural resources can care for their people through world cooperation.

In America we can see problems of like nature approaching; with, as we are told, 61% of our productive topsoils washed into the ocean, and most of our many important mineral and other natural resources, at the present rate of consumption, subject to exhaustion within approximately the next quarter century, we face serious years ahead.

With the minimum American population increase estimated for 1975, which those born today will face as young men and women in their early twenties, our Production and Marketing administration predicts that farmers will have to produce about two-thirds more than they did before World War II.

The question is, can it be done? Or will some Americans go to bed hungry, like three out of four of the people of today's world?

Here is a problem more dangerous than the atomic bomb, and relatively few people are aware of its potential danger. Never in all history has there been such an increase in population of the countries of the world as at present.

Here is an essential work for all people of all countries who, with the Humanists, determine to make world a fit place in which to live, and human life worth living, by a quickened conservation of the world's natural resources, so as to arrest their wasteful exhaustion and wanton destruction, and thus insure their largest preservation and widest beneficial use for man's survival on this planet. It could result gloriously, a heaven here on earth. The Humanist World Digest will help lighten the road. E.O.C.

* * *

THE ORDINARY MAN AND TODAY'S EXTRAORDINARY TASK

By Rev. Laurance L. Cross, Mayor of Berkeley

Woodrow Wilson used to say that he did not believe in government of the people, for the people, and by the people, but government of the people, for the people and by the best of the people . . . We all believe in that but there are problems connected with it. For one thing, there is the problem of deciding who are the best people. Some would say the rich people are the best. Such has not been the story of the past. Others would say the educated people are the best. That, too, has not been demonstrated. Still others would say the religious people. That again, unfortunately, has not proven true.

Another problem is the choosing of the best people. Even though the best people are chosen, if they are self-chosen or clique-chosen, it is dictatorship and not democracy. As Gandhi said, "Good government is no substitute for self-government." So we must come back to the original: government of the people, for the people and by the people, and leave it un-amended. Indeed, one who heard Lincoln's Gettysburg address said that his emphasis made all the difference in the world in the meaning

of it. He said, "That government of the **people**, by the **people**, and for the **people**, might not perish from the earth." That brings us back to the ordinary man, the people. The ordinary man must accomplish our extraordinary task or it will not be accomplished.

The importance of the ordinary man has long been good politics. The founding fathers thought of every man as a king because every man had a vote and no man had more than one. At election time we are still appealed to as kings but, alas! as soon as the votes are counted the king is made to abdicate and pressure groups and selfish interests ascend the throne. The importance of the ordinary man has not only been stressed by politics but recognition from a new source has come now. It is in the realm of economics.

The ordinary man is recognized as a consumer and that is again revolutionary. With the development of mass production methods, it gradually dawned on economists that we cannot go on producing unless we have a great mass of consumers to buy. Indeed, what is advertising which is really a new thing, too, but the cultivation of the consumer? And how can consumers buy unless they have money? And how can they have money unless they have high wages? This idea, indeed, has been called the most important revolution that has taken place since the coming of the machine. Some years ago a group of American manufacturers who were in Europe were asked to give advice upon a certain industrial situation. They studied it carefully and the first item of their counsel was: Double the wages of your employees. The European manufacturers almost fainted in their tracks. Of all the insane prescriptions for a difficult industrial situation, this was the craziest! But the Americans were right.

Alas! not all American manufacturers have learned it. In fact, they seem to have unlearned it since the war. The great struggle of the present day is between the conservatives in business who follow the old doctrine of paying as low wages as possible and the liberals who follow the new theory of paying as high wages as possible so people will have money to buy what is produced. Eric Johnson, former president of the United States Chamber of Commerce is a liberal who believes the only way out of a new depression and the only salvation for capitalism is high production, high wages, and low prices with a small profit on the single sale but large profit on the great volume of sale. In other words, Eric Johnson believes in the importance of the consumer.

Now, what is true in politics, and economics, is surely true in the matter of enduring peace and the extraordinary task of world community which is ours today. What, then, is the ordinary man to do toward this extraordinary task?

I.

First of all, he can create his share of the demand for peace and world community. When movable type was invented ages ago in China, not much came of it, because few people could read, and there was no demand for it. When Gutenberg invented movable type again in the 15th century, much came of it, because by then hundreds of thousands of people could read, and there was a demand for it. The Renaissance had come and people wanted to read the old classics. The Reformation was on the way and the people wanted to read the Bible. Printing had to wait for its public.

Our task as ordinary men and women is to create our share of the demand for cleanness, for racial understanding, for emphasis upon people rather than things, for true values rather than false.

II.

Again, the ordinary man can realize that he is not limited to ordinary things. It was said of the slaves and the peasants who first accepted the religion of Jesus that, "the nobodies of the early church lifted the gates of empire off their hinges." And they did. How did they do it? For one thing, they did it together. There is very grave doubt that Jesus actually founded the Christian church. We read in the New Testament that the disciples were first called Christians at Antioch. That was fifteen or possibly thirty years after Jesus had been crucified.

Jesus spoke of his religion as a "way" or as the Kingdom of God. And founders are rarely organizers. But somebody was inspired to organize the religion of Jesus. And the genius of organization is to make the ordinary man count for much in the greater organization. He is a small cog in a great machine, but an important cog. It has taken the coming of mass production to make us appreciate the little cog. Labor has achieved its power largely through its ability to tie up a very small plant which, in turn, ties up the whole industry. A man may be an ordinary man but he can do an extraordinary work by being part of a great business organization, or a great school system, or a great army. We can find our lives by losing them in such an organization.

III.

Again, the ordinary people can do extraordinary things by merging their energies with great purposes. "There is a tide in the affairs of men". Indeed, there are many tides. There are currents and ground-swells. By riding those tides and joining those currents, an ordinary man can add to his strength the strength of all mankind. Senator George W. Norris, the father of TVA and many another great thing in the life of America, said two weeks before he passed away, "Unselfish faith will prove to be America's greatest resource in the difficult years ahead." Unselfish faith on the part of many ordinary people, I think he was saying, joined together in a common effort, will produce extraordinary results.

The papers carried the story the other day of the passing of an ordinary-extraordinary man. Here is the clipping just as it came from the day's paper:

Port Angeles, Wash., Oct. 25—The "Iron Man of the Hoh," famed for his legendary feats in the Olympic Mountains, died here today. John Huelsdonk, 79-year-old former Iowan who homesteaded on the Hoh river in 1891, earned his "Iron Man" title carrying such items as cook stoves over Olympic mountain trails on his back. Thirty years ago, when mountain trails were being built extensively, he carried loads of provisions running up to 200 pounds on his back for construction crews.

He did this not for bravado, but for two men's pay. And two men's pay during the short working season helped his four daughters through the university. Once a forest ranger met him on the trail between Forks and the Huelsdonk ranch. The barrel-chested settler had a cook stove on his back and was trudging down the forest aisle.

"That must be quite a load, eh, John?" the ranger asked.

"Well," Huelsdonk replied, "it isn't so bad, only there's a sack of flour in the oven that keeps shifting around and unsettling the load."

It is not hard to see how this ordinary man, at least ordinary except for his physical strength, fastened his energies to the purpose of sending four daughters to university, thus sending them forth to found four families, and then those four families founding say 16 families, that the "Iron Man of the Hoh" had made possible through the extremely ordinary task of carrying a load on his back even as slaves have done from the beginning

of time. The ordinary man thus through perfectly natural means of organization and of movement accomplishes the extraordinary task.

* * *

ADLAI STEVENSON DEFENDS BILL OF RIGHTS

In vetoing the Broyles Bill, passed by the Legislature of Illinois, Governor Stevenson shows courageous non-partisan stand against forces of reaction. The following is the veto message of the governor:

I herewith return, without my approval, Senate Bill No. 102, entitled "An Act to protect against subversive activities by making it a crime to commit or advocate acts intended to effect the overthrow of the Government of the United States or the State of Illinois or of any political subdivision thereof by violence or other unlawful means, or to attempt or conspire so to do, by defining subversive organizations and making them illegal, by establishing procedures to insure the loyalty of candidates for public office and of public officers and employees, and providing for the enforcement of the provisions of said Act, and providing penalties for the violation thereof."

I veto and withhold my approval from this bill for the following reasons:

"The stated purpose of this bill is to combat the menace of world communism. That the Communist party — and all it stands for — is a danger to our Republic, as real as it is sinister, is clear to all who have slightest understanding of our democracy. No one attached to the principles of our society will debate this premise or quarrel with the objectives of this bill.

Agreed upon ends, our concern is with means. It is in the choice of methods to deal with recognized problems that we Americans, in and out of public life, so often develop differences of opinion. Our freedom to do so is a great source of strength and, if not impaired by mistakes of our own, will contribute greatly to the ultimate confusion of the enemies of freedom.

The issue with respect to means raised by this bill has two aspects. One is the question of the need for it in relation to existing weapons for the control of subversives. The other is whether this addition to our arsenal may not be a two-edged sword, more dangerous to ourselves than to our foes.

Were the latter alone involved, I should hesitate to impose my judgment upon that of the majority of the General Assembly. But it is precisely because the evil at hand has long since

been identified and provided against that we here in Illinois need not now do something bad just for the sake of doing something.

What are the facts with respect to need? On June 4 last, the Supreme Court of the United States affirmed the conviction of the twelve top leaders of the Communist party in the United States. They were indicted under the provisions of an Act of Congress (the so-called "Smith Act") for conspiring (1) to organize as the Communist party a society for the teaching and advocacy of the overthrow and destruction of the government of the United States (which by definition in the Act includes the governments of the states and their political subdivisions) by force and violence, and (2) to advocate and teach the overthrow of the government of the United States, as so defined, by force and violence.

Close upon the heels of this opinion, the federal government has moved to indict twenty-one more known Communist leaders. It is, of course, no secret that the Federal Bureau of Investigation has identified and has under observation virtually every member of the Communist party and every serious sympathizer, and is prepared to take such persons into custody on short notice.

But Senate Bill 102 is unnecessary not alone because of the federal anti-subversive law and activity, but because under the existing laws of Illinois it is now, and has been since 1919, a felony for any person to advocate the reformation or overthrow, by violence or other unlawful means, of the state or federal government, or to assist in the organization, or to become a member of, any organization dedicated to that objective. Our laws also prohibit the compensation from state funds of subversive employees or members of subversive organizations.

Senate Bill No. 102 makes it a felony to commit or attempt any act intended to overthrow by force the federal or state governments, or any of their political subdivisions; to advocate or teach the commission of such acts; or to have any connection with an organization devoted to such an objective. This approach parallels and duplicates criminal statutes of both the federal and state governments already in effect. Nor am I aware of complaints by any State's Attorneys throughout Illinois that our present sedition laws are insufficient.

Not only does Senate Bill No. 102 appear wholly unnecessary, but I agree with the Bar Associations that if the present sedition laws could be strengthened by expressly prohibiting the com-

mission of acts as well as the advocacy thereof, this could best be accomplished by amending the existing laws rather than enacting new and more laws. Criminals laws, especially on subjects of vital importance, should not be confused by patchwork and duplication.

But it is in the enforcement provisions that I find this bill most objectionable. The Attorney General of Illinois is directed to appoint a Special Assistant Attorney General who must assemble and deliver to the State's Attorney of each county all information relating to subversive acts or activities within such county. The local State's Attorney then must present this matter to the Grand Jury. The Assistant Attorney General in Springfield must maintain complete records of all such information which may, with the permission of the Attorney General, be made public.

This transmission of such information and the subsequent presentation of it to the Grand Jury is mandatory under the Act — and covers in terms all information, however inconclusive or insignificant I know of no precedent of any such interference with the normal discretion accorded to a public prosecutor. One of the important responsibilities of State's Attorneys and one of the greatest protections of the citizen is the exercise of sound judgment in sifting the many rumors, charges and counter-charges which come to State's Attorneys' attention. This is true in the operation of the criminal laws generally, and it must, of necessity, be even more true when we are dealing with criminal laws relating in large degree to the state of men's minds.

I can see nothing but grave peril to the reputations of innocent people in this perpetuation of rumors and hearsay. When we already have sedition laws prohibiting the offenses to which these provisions relate, I see more danger than safety in such radical change in the administration of criminal justice.

Other substantive provisions in the bill are intended to assure the loyalty of the employees of the state government and its political subdivisions. All agencies of government must establish procedures to ascertain that there are no reasonable grounds to believe that any applicant for employment is committed, by act or teaching, to the overthrow of the government by force or is a member of an organization dedicated to that purpose. Thus, one who wishes to work for the state or to teach in a school must himself carry the burden of proving the absence of any reasonable grounds for belief that he is subversive or even be-

longs to a subversive organization. The bill does not even require that the applicant for employment know the purpose of such an organization.

Provisions as to those already employed also shift the burden of proof to the employee. With all the multitude of employing agencies throughout the State, each establishing its own rule and procedures for the enforcement of these provisions, it is easy to see what variations there might be and what possibilities for discrimination depending upon the wisdom and fairness of the particular employer.

By such provisions as these, irreparable injury to the reputation of innocent persons is more than a possibility, it is a likelihood. If this bill became law, it would be only human for employees to play safe and shirk duties which might bring upon them resentment or criticism. Public service requires independent and courageous action on matters which affect countless private interests. We cannot afford to make public employees vulnerable to malicious charges of disloyalty. So far as the employers are concerned—heads of departments and of schools and so on—the only safe policy would be timid employment practices which could only result in a lowering of the level of ability, independence and courage in our public agencies, schools and colleges.

Lastly, the bill provides that candidates for public office, other than offices for which an oath is prescribed by the Constitution, shall file an affidavit that he is not a subversive person. The Attorney General informs me that, despite the exception made, this requirement is of dubious constitutionality.

Does anyone seriously think that a real traitor will hesitate to sign a loyalty oath? Of course not. Really dangerous subversives and saboteurs will be caught by careful, constant, professional investigation, not by pieces of paper.

The whole notion of loyalty inquisitions is a natural characteristic of the police state, not of democracy. Knowing his rule rests upon compulsion rather than consent, the dictator must always assume the disloyalty, not for a few but of many, and guard against it by continual inquisition and "liquidation" of the unreliable. The history of Soviet Russia is a modern example of this ancient practice. The democratic state, on the other hand, is based on the consent of its members. The vast majority of our people are intensely loyal, as they have amply demonstrated. To question, even by implication, the loyalty and devotion of a

large group of citizens is to create an atmosphere of suspicion and distrust which is neither justified, healthy nor consistent with our traditions.

Legislation of this type, in Illinois and elsewhere, is the direct result of the menacing gains of communism in Europe and Asia. But it would be unrealistic, if not naive, to assume that such legislation would be effective in combatting Communist treachery in America. Such state laws have nowhere uncovered a single case of subversive disloyalty.

Basically, the effect of this legislation, then, will be less the detection of subversives and more the intimidation of honest citizens. But we cannot suppress thought and expression and preserve the freedoms guaranteed by the Bill of Rights. That is our dilemma. In time of danger we seek to protect ourselves from sedition, but in doing so we imperil the very freedoms we seek to protect, just as we did in the evil atmosphere of the alien and sedition laws of John Adams' administration and just as Britain did during the Napoleonic era. To resolve the dilemma we will all agree that in the last analysis the Republic must be protected at all costs, or there will be no freedoms to preserve or even regain. But if better means of protection already exist, then surely we should not further imperil the strength of freedom in search of illusory safety.

We must fight traitors with laws. We already have the laws. We must fight falsehood and evil ideas with truth and better ideas. We have them in plenty. But we must not confuse the two. Laws infringing our rights and intimidating unoffending persons without enlarging our security will neither catch subversives nor win converts to our better ideas. And in the long run evil ideas can be counteracted and conquered not by laws but only by better ideas.

Finally, the states are not, in my judgment, equipped to deal with the threat of the world Communist movement which inspired this bill. Communism threatens us because it threatens world peace. The great problems with which communism confronts us are problems of foreign relations and national defense. Our Constitution wisely leaves the solution of such matters to the national government.

In conclusion, while I respect the motives and patriotism of the proponents of this bill, I think there is in it more of danger to the liberties we seek to protect than of security for the Republic. It reverses our traditional concept of justice by placing

upon the accused the burden of proving himself innocent. It makes felons of persons who may be guilty more of bad judgment than of anything else. It jeopardizes the freedom of sincere and honest citizens in an attempt to catch and punish subversives. It is unnecessary and redundant.

I know full well that this veto will be distorted and misunderstood, even as telling the truth of what I knew about the reputation of Alger Hiss was distorted and misunderstood. I know that to veto this bill in this period of grave anxiety will be unpopular with many. But I must, in good conscience, protest against any unnecessary suppression of our ancient rights as free men. Moreover, we will win the contest of ideas that afflicts the world not by suppressing these rights, but by their triumph. We must not burn down the house to kill the rats.

* * *

RELIGION vs. PHILOSOPHY

H. G. Wells's widely read novel "Soul of a Bishop" gives us plenty of food for our thought. A revolution in creed and tenet has been made in the religious world since Darwin's theory of evolution was universally recognized, for the origin of the species now called man is to be traced back on the stage of its development several million years ago, to the origin of the species now known as an ape. The Christian Bible, for instance, subsequently lost its divine authority, the Hebrew of Genesis as stated in the Old Testament having become a thing in the past, a worn-out, out-of-date, stale one with no attraction for men of science and enlightened thought.

H. G. Wells's "Bishop," after his long insomnia caused by the irreconcilable contradiction between what the Bible says and that which his reason and conscience dictate, abandons the church, his enviable diocese, which is the only way for him to save his soul. The Bishop cannot believe in Trinity; he works on the fundamental principle of the fatherhood of God and the sonship of man. Thus the bishop builds up a new church founded on the basis of Universal Brotherhood as well as on the firm foundation of modern science and philosophy.

The Bishop contends that the church should be galvanized by stirring up ethical enthusiasm in its social work, eliminating the myth and the miracles so full in the Bible as much as possible, which are prone to bring about blind faith and superstition, and that religion should be built on philosophy and scientific

understanding so that hypocrisy and sham work may be once and for all wiped out of the world and thus root out the source of strife and war.

Each of us has his own philosophy of life just as he has his own mode of thought and life. The habit of thought is the second nature of man and each one can form his habit of thought according to his inclination and environment as is well expressed by "One's destiny is in his own hands." Bernard Shaw calls Napoleon Bonaparte "Man of Destiny" which he means that human destiny is beyond the power of man. Fatalism is built on Shaw's idea of human destiny but the Christian, as well as any other religious believer, doesn't believe in fatalism, the essence of all religions being the guidance and protection of the Almighty.

In this respect philosophy naturally stands aloof or rather between the doctrine of divine protection and that of fatalism. Needless to say, philosophy is a branch of pure science, as it is in the domain of logic and reason as much as any other branch of science. Philosophy is built on experiment and on the facts and realities as they exist in the human life. Philosophy is tremendously influenced by the Law of Nature or Cosmic Law; hence man can modify to a large extent his destiny by faithfully obeying the Cosmic Law.

The problem of Religion vs. Philosophy may be treated in a like manner as that of Democracy vs. Communism. To keep the golden mean is the only way to get these conflicting ideologies harmoniously reconciled for the permanent peace of the world. It will be in vain to have the one subdued by the other because both ideologies of Marxian communism and Thomas Jefferson's democracy will coexist as long as man continues to live on earth. A few wise men alone, however, know the real value of reconciliation, while, on the other hand, men of insanity, so full in the world today, are in tempestuous hurry to decide the current ideological war by inhumanly using the atomic bomb in a World War III.

Just like in the ideological cold war, the pernicious strife between religion and philosophy is being kept on as fierce as ever to the damnation of humanity. This must be discontinued if each of them desires to be of service to mankind. The religious orthodoxy is as much detested by the philosopher as the religionist hates pure philosophy that has no root in religion. Hence the world today urgently needs for the general welfare of mankind

a New religion whose creed is compatible with the principle of philosophy.

Kingsley's "Hypatheia" as fascinatingly describes the final collapse of Hypatheia's cold-reasoned philosophy in spite of her one-time reputation as the prophetess of Alexandria. Philosophy has its eternal life in religion inasmuch as the latter has its actual power and influence in the former. They must go hand in hand in the spirit of mutual help and cooperation if they are to serve the human race through the establishment of permanent peace on earth. They can well be compared to the wheels of a cart: so closely related to each other in their immediacies. A New Religion is in the making just now to meet the need of the times. Let us proclaim with one accord, "Go ahead!"

—From "Truth Quest," published by Young Men's League
of Human Fellowship of Japan

* * *

A NEW AUTHORITARIANISM

By Norman Thomas

Six-time Socialist Party candidate for President—in 1928, 1932, 1936, 1940, 1944 and 1948—Norman Thomas is not running this year. He is known to millions of Americans as a radio and television speaker, and as an author and journalist.

Since the early Twenties he has been prominently identified with the ACLU and has served as a member of the Union's Board of Directors since 1934.

The response that the young Yale graduate, William Buckley, has evoked by his book, "God and Man at Yale," and by his numerous radio and television appearances, must concern all believers in academic freedom.

I am not an authority on the degree of accuracy of many of Mr. Buckley's statements which have been sharply challenged by his critics. But every sensible observer of the American scene must realize how ridiculous is the charge made or strongly implied by Mr. Buckley that Yale and other American colleges are turning out hundreds of radicals who subtly or openly are undermining "the American way of life." I doubt if Mr. Buckley really believes that Yale radicalism is so potent, or he would not so calmly propose that the alumni should take over specifically the control of education at their alma mater.

Mr. Buckley's version of the American way of life is authoritarian religion and free enterprise economy. He is, as he has every right to be, a Roman Catholic, but he seems to argue that modern Yale is betraying the faith of its Puritan fathers. They

most emphatically would not teach Mr. Buckley's brand of religion. His economics have been taken to task by some Catholic critics for their very considerable divergence from the principles set down in various papal encyclicals.

Be that as it may, Mr. Buckley seems to have created a united front between sincere believers in the importance of teaching an authoritarian religion, and men who in the past have been conspicuous for their lack of such faith. These strange allies seem to agree in thinking that Mr. Buckley's book a good stick to beat the communist, or at any rate the socialist, wolf who lurks in sheep's clothing in the chapels and classrooms of our colleges.

One reason for the popularity of Mr. Buckley's thesis is that he loudly protests his opposition to statism. He doesn't want the state to regulate an erring Yale. He does not now call upon the church to exercise official authority.

Instead, to considerable popular applause, he proposes his own form of control of college education. It is to be exerted by the alumni and by parents. They will shop around for the education that they like as if it were soap, and only support those colleges which give it. There will be a sort of freedom of rival brands of education in the educational market, but precious little freedom for the teacher intent on seeking truth and imparting it.

Mr. Buckley's ideal university would have less intellectual freedom than existed in medieval universities which were controlled by the scholars who taught in them. He does not believe in the Jeffersonian principle that truth can win its own victory. For him it needs to be protected by the alumni who have the most money to give and the most prominence in those enormous corporations which—to his naive mind—prove how free is enterprise in America.

This is not a field in which can can talk absolutes. Every generation will properly see to it that its children are taught or given a chance to learn the things that it believes. Followers of creeds, religious, political or economic, have a right to teach their creeds. Nevertheless, America owes much of her happiness and more of her freedom to the wide acceptance of the notion that her public schools and great universities encourage the search after truth and to the competition of ideas on the basis of their appeal to men's minds and hearts.

The case which is made, rightly I think, against communist teachers in schools is that they have signed over control of their consciences to an outside political organization, thus losing the

freedom on which good education depends. It is a case that most emphatically applies also to members of the Ku Klux Klan or other fascists.

For my part, I would not like to substitute Yale alumni for communists or fascists as keepers of the conscience of Yale professors. It is time that Americans do some straight thinking about the way in which in the name of opposition to communist control, other types of authoritarianism challenge any sound conception of education or civil liberty.

—A.C.L.U.

* * *

POPE'S VETO DOOMS MILLIONS

A threatened boycott of the United Nations' World Health Organization by Catholic representatives, which effectively paralyzed that body and prevented it from considering a recent resolution for study of world population problems, was protested by Lord Horder, chairman of the British Family Planning Association, in a letter published in the London Times of May 23. Lord Horder wrote:

"By this form of veto they (Roman Catholic leaders) have possibly prevented action which might have saved millions of lives . . . Roman Catholics have a right to act by their own creed and conscience, but the rest of the world should have the courage and determination to do the same. It would seem that in this matter the Roman Catholic 'conscience doth make cowards of us all.' . . ."

Two weeks later, the Vatican newspaper, L'Osservatore Romano, again proclaimed the Holy See's opposition to any study of population control measures by blasting the UN for what the newspaper termed a "cynical policy," apparently feeling that even to have allowed the Norwegian delegate to introduce the resolution was to display "cynicism."

"Behind the curtain of soothing resolutions and apparently innocuous paraphrases," L'Osservatore declared, there had taken place for more than a year a "laborious weaving of a demographic (population) policy by the UN that aims at resolving the problem caused by the increase of births over deaths."

The article quoted Pope Pius XII's October 29 address to Italian midwives, in which he said that "every human being, even the baby in the maternal womb, has the right to live." Later, the Vatican "clarified" this by saying that a mother may "decide whether she wishes her child to be born at the cost of her own life."

AVERT THIS CALAMITY!

"There is but one point in reference to which any feelings of alarm are in the smallest degree justifiable—this is the public school system. We could suffer no national calamity more far-reaching in its effects than would be implied in the abandonment of our system of nonsectarian schools; and it is a very unfortunate thing for any man, or body of men, to be identified with opposition thereto. But it must be borne in mind that hostility to the public schools is not really a question of sects at all; it is merely an illustration of the survival or importation here of the utterly un-American and thoroughly Old-World idea of the subordination of the layman to the priest. Not a few Protestant clergymen oppose our public schools on the one hand, and an ever-increasing number of Catholic laymen support them on the other. . . ."

"The fight is not one between creeds; it is an issue between intelligent American laymen of every faith on the one hand, and ambitious, foolish, or misguided supporters of a worn-out system of clerical government on the other—these supporters including Episcopalians and Presbyterians as well as Catholics. Our public school system is here to stay; it cannot be overturned; whenever hurt, even, it is only at the much greater cost of the person hurting it. . . ."—Theodore Roosevelt, as quoted in the "Scottish Rite News Bulletin."

* * *

ROAD TO SURVIVAL

A Report by Henry Seidel Canby

Mr. Vogt's book will make you feel better—I do not say happier—about the atomic bomb. For it turns out that is not the worst danger facing the human race. There is a greater, an almost overwhelming menace—which we can still do something about, at least in the more fortunate parts of the world—the danger of overpopulation, of the ruin as a producer of sufficient food of the only planet we possess, the Earth.

Mr. Vogt's book is the most comprehensive and most impressive of a series of recent books on this subject, which, in spite of their desperate importance, have as yet only dented the public consciousness. He is dealing with familiar facts. He tells of the little Mexican woman trotting with a gasoline can on her head five miles to the nearest water; Cobbett, the English miner, remembering when there was still coal enough in England to

keep the country rich; Ramsey, the Western college president, realizing that he cannot send his children to college because the cattle ranges of his state have been wrecked by overgrazing; Hanranlian, the lumberman, guessing too late that the next forests he is to cut will sooner or later doom the city below them by destroying its water power; the displaced persons of the late war wandering over the world and finding everywhere countries already too overpopulated to support them; Wong, the Chinese, last step in the process, sitting down by the roadside with thousands of his kind, to die of starvation.

He demonstrates coolly and completely that the advance in technology is close to sealing our doom. That the plough and the axe have already cost the United States one-third of the topsoil by which we have to live. That the exploitation of the whole world, to make food plentiful for the fortunate, has been followed by such an increase of population as to make the continuance of anything like civilization improbable in the backward countries, and to threaten life as we know it even in land-rich Russia and the United States. Since we took over Puerto Rico its population has doubled and it is a slum. The population of India has probably tripled since the English came, and famine is always just around the corner.

Did you know that even in South America, there are only four countries not dangerously overpopulated? Did you know that the best observers believe that the optimum population (by which they mean the most desirable population) of the United States—after our century or two of hacking, mining, and burning—is a hundred million, and we have one hundred and fifty! Yet we are perhaps the most fortunate country still on earth.

Did you believe that we can make food when we need it from minerals, or wood, and with new power? But the soil and its plants are far more efficient, and these we have been destroying at a rate which goes up and up. The great burst of Western civilization and Western science was made possible by draining food from all the unexploited world. That can never happen again. The age-long flourishing of the great Asiatic populations of the past was possible because they kept their populations down. Greece, in its great period, was a rich and fruitful land in strong contrast to its barren present, because the Greeks kept their numbers steady by (to put it brutally) prostitution and infanticide, and by carefully planned emigration and the formation of colonies.

But Mr. Vogt's book is by no means a wail of despair. There are two means of escape. First and most obvious, birth control, by education preferably, with the sheer stark necessity making any prejudices absurd. And the second safeguard is conservation and reconstruction, still possible in many areas, especially our own. Science, which has unexpectedly proved to be a great destroyer, must be itself re-educated.

According to Mr. Vogt, we have only a little time, more than the atom bomb used as a weapon would give us, but only a few decades in which the tide must be turned.

The success of such re-education and such converted science is absolutely dependent upon an enlightened public opinion, and that, of course, is the purpose of this book. But even those who may be carelessly uninterested in what happens to this planet after they leave it, will still read his extraordinary revelations of what is happening to our Mother Earth, unobserved by most of us, with fascinated interest.

* * *

A NEW TECHNIQUE IN REVOLUTIONS!

By Rammanohar Lohia

As a man engaged in politics, I have had little to do with religion, and more often than not, I have satisfied myself with usual belief that religion and politics ought to be separate, that politics ought to devote itself to secular subjects while religion confine itself to the relationship between individual man and whatever his God may be. Such a belief has been found to be wanting in India as elsewhere, particularly because politics necessarily cannot embrace a very large sphere of human life.

Apart from this inadequacy, politics, because it deals with power, has tended to produce much bitterness and hatred. For this reason I am aware of the fact that throughout the world, in Asia and in Europe, there has been a revival of religion, although a revival which, in many cases, not not been helpful to mankind; for although men and women may have turned to religion in order to satisfy some basic urge for good will and peace, for the resolving of bitterness and hatred, they often find themselves in a far deeper sea of bitterness and hatred than what they have left. One of the grave maladies that has affected the Asian masses is precisely this bitterness and hatred which grows out of religion's exclusiveness. Instead of infusing politics with more ethical standards religions themselves have become political in

the worst sense of the term. And not only has this phenomenon been noticed in Asia, but also in Europe in another way. The revival of religion has meant sustaining a structure of property relationships where some own and many others are dispossessed. The time has now come when the world of politics and the world of religion might strike a better understanding. I would not suggest for a moment that the secular basis of politics be given up. That has to be maintained; but it would be very wonderful if some way could be found whereby men would acquire a deeper understanding of the forces in operation, and men of religion and men of politics could help each other in order to improve the lot of people all over the world.

As a politician, I would suggest that men of religion could be of some help to us if they would give up trying to use religion to sustain and enforce a system of property relationships which men of politics find unjust and wish to destroy. On the other hand, men of politics should give some assurance that they will not use hatred and jealousy as weapons in order to achieve their aims.

I believe in revolutions, and being from India, I believe in them especially for my country. The extreme distribution of poverty and wealth necessitates this point of view. But we have had many revolutions before, all over the world. Almost all started with the estimable idea of liberty and equality, and almost all have ended up by introducing a new tyranny in place of the old. All the world over basic and sharp disillusionment amounting to disbelief has entered men's minds. They have almost come to the conclusion that nothing we could do would ever matter—tyranny will be always with them. We in India have come to the conclusion that the basic mistake has been that revolutions hitherto have always been carried out in a spirit of jealousy and hatred. Would it now be possible to carry out a revolution in the spirit of sympathy and—I will add—anger. Not bitterness, jealousy, or hatred, but sympathy and anger. Anger very definitely because it very often was the impetus behind Gandhi's revolt against the British. He shepherded millions of his countrymen into peaceful attacks against the legal structure, although many thousands of his followers were killed by those in authority. Anger was not eliminated, but there was every attempt to eliminate jealousy and hatred, because hatred leads a man downward but anger against injustice is likely to lead him upward.

India today has a productive equipment of not more than \$35

per worker whereas you in America have a productive equipment equivalent to about \$2,000 per worker. And practically two-thirds of the world is in the same condition as India. Our population is squeezed into 300 persons per square mile. This is our poverty. Even those who own land have an average acreage of about $1\frac{1}{2}$ or 2 acres per person. I suppose those of you who have anything to do with farming realize how pitiful that acreage is. In America nobody would understand how a farmer could live on 2 acres per person. Your average acreage is about 100 acres per person. And in the midst of this land-poor situation in India there are many groups who try to snatch away as large a share of the national income as possible—the big land owners, big business, and the princes and feudal lords.

What shall we do in this situation? Shall we sit on our hands until some kind of election takes place every five years and be content with the one vote we can exercise? The Socialist Party has made its choice. It lies in revolution by peaceful means, not revolution by guns and bombs. The means we shall employ shall grow out of a spirit of sympathy driven by anger, for no man who is prepared and willing to resist injustice can deprive himself of this great and good quality of anger. If his eye does not redden at an act of injustice, he shall hardly be in a position to shed a tear of sympathy.

I would like to say at this point that it is not only resistance to injustice, but constructive daily activities that are underaken by political parties in Asia, particularly in India. Because it would not be possible for a whole village to engage in a work project unless they knew its benefits would aid them, our party has, during the last three years, attempted to gather whole villages for digging irrigation ditches, building dams, canals, roads and the like. Our projects have not utilized iron and steel for these obviously cost money, and India has little money. We have concentrated on earthworks which will immediately benefit the village at hand. I am not implying that these earthworks are sufficient for our needs, but with a country of 350 million people and 700,000 villages, all the available money from our own government and/or the richest nation in the world would go a very little way towards industrializing ourselves on a Western basis. Thus the idea which the Socialist Party has been trying to place before the Indian people is that if a man works seven or eight hours for himself and his family, let him then devote an hour or half an hour for reconstructing his community and his village.

We have succeeded somewhat, but only by way of more or less placing a model before the people. We know that success in this direction can only come if landlordism is abolished and every family owns a piece of land adequate for its support.

What I have said about India applies to Asia as a whole. The two prongs of our policy are constructive activity on the one hand, and peaceful resistance to injustice on the other hand. We have tried to symbolize it in our country with the "spade" and the "prison."

At this point I would like to talk not about how America can help India, but how India can help you. At the moment the idea of force is dominant. All over the world people feel that guns and atom bombs are the answer to injustices. If the American people would borrow the Indian weapon of civil disobedience in answer to many of the evils in their own country, we could legitimately conclude that world opinion would swing in favor of the rule of peaceful protest as against violent forms of action. This is one way you could assist two-thirds of the world. There is, of course, another way to help and be helped—and that is, in order to preserve what you have achieved, you might start helping others to create what they are unable to with their small resources. If you could offer Asia not only technical assistance and money—but a reinforced faith in peaceful weapons of protest, the horrible spectre of war might be lessened. When I see a city like New York with its tall buildings and enormous masses of people, I, too, am affected by the horror war might bring to America. If there is any way to preserve mankind from the destructiveness of another world struggle, we of Asia would like to do our share of the work—and we will do it by reconstructing our country and resisting injustice peacefully, in "sympathy and anger."

—Socialist Advocate

* * *

POINTS OF VIEW

(Methodist Bishops Express Some Worthy Points on Political and Religious Issues)

Here are the views of the Council of Bishops of the Methodist Church on a number of political and religious questions as expressed April 24, 1952, by Bishop Paul B. Kern of Nashville, Tenn., at the Church's quadrennial General Conference:

POLITICAL

Arms Race—"We must keep disarmament before the nations as they seek an alternative to war. Weight of armaments . . . has never yet brought peace."

Freedom—"Concerted and often vicious efforts to regiment thought and curb freedom of speech" in religion, politics and education are being made in the United States by "reckless demagogues."

Optimism—"If we, in calmness and confidence, shall yield ourselves and the Nation we love to the sway of His unfolding will, we shall yet see a spiritual rebirth from which shall spring an ordered and just society."

Peace—"Nothing could be more disastrous than a fatalistic acceptance of the inevitability of World War III."

Universal Military Training—"This radical departure from the American way of life is both unnecessary and morally dangerous."

Economics—"It should be clearly understood that our Church must not be maneuvered into the defense of any political party or economic philosophy."

Ambassador to Vatican—"We want no representative to any Church-State."

Youth—"If they did not react sensitively, yea rebelliously, to all this tragedy that surrounds them they would betray their spiritual birthright and become a dead and spiritless drag upon the future."

United Nations—"We can unswervingly hold to our faith in the United Nations."

Korea—"The willingness to assume so large a share of this burden of tragedy, both at home and abroad, is the pledge to free men everywhere that the only war we seek is a relentless struggle against despotism, poverty and human bondage."

RELIGIOUS

Ecumenical Church—"The most significant movement of modern religious history is the growth of the ecumenical Church throughout the world. We must be realistic in our ecumenical enthusiasms."

Race Prejudice—"There is no reason why we could not demonstrate by our patience, our forbearance, and our vision a solution of this problem which would be just and Christlike to all races."

Temperance—"We call our people to the high doctrine of total abstinence . . ."

NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION

This organization whose headquarters are at 3308 - 14th Street, N.W., Washington 10, D. C., has a humanistic conservation program which deserves support, namely:

The Atom Bomb is a weapon of terrible destruction. This is a fact that everyone in the world knows and appreciates. Millions of dollars are spent and almost everyone is studying ways and means to defend against its deadly effect.

Carelessness and wastefulness are causing far more damage, death and destruction every day in the U. S. than several atom bombs. True, they are much less spectacular and concentrated in their effect so that few people take them seriously or try to do anything about them.

The potential strength of our nation is being drained daily by lack of good sound conservation methods. Soil erosion, dust storms, floods, droughts, water pollution, all of these and many more have a violent effect on our national economy. Slowly but steadily, our ability to produce is being undermined.

As the cost of farming, lumbering and production rises, money is being drained from the pocketbook of every single resident of this country as has already been done in most of the lands of the world.

Conservation is the only defense against this continual loss of productivity. The methods of checking erosion, floods and other ills of the land are well known. The task of spreading this information and convincing people throughout the country of the tremendous savings that can be accomplished with so little effort and expenditure is a big one. This is the job they have set for themselves. They need help. By helping them, you help yourself, your children and the generations of the future, in the years to come. Can they depend on you?

A contribution in exchange for the full color Wildlife Stamps will be put to work immediately in the defense of our natural resources which are shrinking constantly through lack of proper management.

Help them, help us to keep America strong. Help us to keep America the beautiful, productive country it is. We suggest you write them for further information.

RESPONSIBILITY

Let us gain from the experience of past events by using their values for the present and future. We created wonderful things;

but we cannot sustain ourselves on past performances. We must plan and create better things, or else we are doomed. While life may be harsh at times, it can also be splendid in the thrill and pride of doing our duty under hardships and sacrifice. Things never remain the same. Life has a goal to achieve . . . **mankind must become one happy family all over the world.** This generation has the greatest opportunity of making this possible. It is our responsibility, and our only salvation!

THE ONE COMMON TRAIT

I look for vast changes in religion. I expect the next 50 years will see a moving away from many of the creeds, the doctrines and the rituals that have come to seem such an essential part of religion, and a moving toward a greater emphasis on man's bond with his fellows and on the good life here on earth. The best faith and the best practice are found in the sympathy of man for man. It is the one trait common to all religions, and the trait of all regions.

—Cyrus S. Eaton

* * *

As for the future, it is up to the human race to work out its own destiny upon this globe. Humanism denies that there is any over-arching fate that is either helping or hindering man's progress and well-being. Nature as a whole is strictly neutral toward human aims and endeavors. Nor is man in the grip of purely materialistic, impersonal determinism that has controlled all the past and predestined all the future. Within certain limits prescribed by our earthly circumstances and by scientific law, individual human beings, entire nations and mankind in general are free to choose the paths that they truly wish to follow. To a significant degree they are the molders of their own fate and hold in their own hands the shape of things to come.

Man has already gone far during the relatively short period—not more than 500,000 years—since he appeared upon this planet, and during the brief episode—not more than 6,000 years—since what we call civilization, came into existence. He has mastered the face of the earth, the depths of the sea and the heights of the air, subduing and turning to his own uses the mighty forces of nature. He has charted the vast regions of interstellar space, with their billions of stars and nebulae; he has penetrated into the farthest recesses of the atom, discovering its most potent secrets. He has become a veritable Hercules by multiplying his productive powers through prodigious and intri-

cate machines. He has built great cities and civilizations upon every continent. He has built great cities and civilizations upon cultural forms; and invented the scientific method that leads to the attainment of truth and to the possibility of continuing progress.

—Corliss Lamont in *Humanism as a Philosophy*

* * *

AS THE SON GOES FORTH TO HARVEST

My Dear "Bud":

Herewith is check in the amount of \$10.00 which your pride wouldn't let you take before you left today. Don't be so touchy. If you need anything and can give a good reason for its requirement, don't expect the other fellow to anticipate your needs. If you do you will invariably find that you will not get the results you desire, as the other fellow is always entitled to know the circumstances.

If you are careful and don't become too important this will keep you going until you get some money, and bear in mind that it is safer to live up to what you have done, than it is to live up to what you think you should have. It is okay to think yourself important, but don't try to make others think so, particularly if you are not. If you are, they will know it without your telling them. If you're not, they will think you under-rate their intelligence, and most people resent that.

Be good and keep your mother posted on how you are getting along. She will send you the pass when you want to come up.

With love from

Your Father

* * *

FROM THE STRIKER

Some day, when all are toilers,
And nobody toils for naught,
When the worker rules over kirks and schools,
And shapes all the realm of thought:
They shall sing the song of the striker,
No longer an outcast be,
But with arms abreast he shall stand confessed
In the triumph that is to be.

—Robert Whitaker

REVIEWS

LAND FOR TOMORROW: The Underdeveloped World, by L. Dudley Stamp. 230 pp. 1952. Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana Univ. Press. \$4.

In this book Dr. Stamp, English geographer who has long turned his attention to land problems, summarizes his lectures for The Patten Foundation at Indiana University in 1949-50. The particular problem with which he deals is "that of matching the world's use of its natural resources with the needs of its people." He attempts to steer a middle course between those who see population control as the only "road to survival" and those who see "new worlds emerging" in undeveloped lands such as the tropics.

The author points out that "the American population is growing at a far greater rate than India's 'teeming millions'" and, furthermore, that the white peoples of the world have gained more in numbers than other people. Whites have, in fact, increased tenfold in the past century, or four times as rapidly as the total world population. In treating the world's lands, Dr. Stamp emphasizes the limits of physical and climatic conditions controlling the growth of crops desired by man. Acknowledging a couple of million square miles of underdeveloped land in the tropics, he admits the enormous difficulties of bringing them into use. He calls for more study and better techniques, pointing to failure of past projects, such as the now-famous Groundnut Scheme of the British in east Africa.

In a chapter "Food For All," the point is made that if output per unit area is the criterion, maximum agricultural efficiency is found in China, Java, and northwestern Europe. With present knowledge and range of crops, the United States, Argentina, and Canada are the underdeveloped countries. "Is there any reason why output per acre in these areas should not be brought up to northwest European levels?" asks the author. One of the interesting conclusions of the book is that the truly underdeveloped areas, in relation to potentiality, are most likely to be found in our familiar middle latitudes rather than in the tropics.

One finishes the book feeling that he has been introduced to some new points of view and numerous facts neatly presented, but that the problem the author set out to treat is not solved, even theoretically. The "ifs" that condition its solution are prodigious. There are a few references and an index, along with a fair amount of graphic and tabular material.

To one interested in the food-population problem, and to whom this book may appeal, the reviewer calls attention to several other popular works on the subject that have appeared rather recently. They are: "Let There Be Bread" by Robert Brittain, journalist turned philosopher; a symposium by English authors entitled "Four Thousand Million Mouths"; and "The Geography of Hunger," a controversial book by Josué de Castro, chairman of the FAO Executive Council. And one should not overlook Bertrand Russell's "New Hopes for a Changing World," most vigorous and stimulating of them all.

—Edward H. Graham, in "Soil Conservation," official organ of The Soil Conservation Service, (Sept. '52).

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Humanist World Digest:

Am interested in your organization and publication. Hope to contribute something later. Have myself borne considerable organization expense here.

—F. A., Arkansas

Gentlemen:

I have received a copy of "Humanist World Digest," which I find quite readable. Many thanks.

W. K., Massachusetts

Dear Sirs:

I certainly thank someone for send me the sample copy. (Subscription enclosed.)

Cordially,

O. W., Oregon

Dear Friends:

I liked the magazine very much and passed it on to a friend who said he would subscribe. Am wondering who sent my name to you. Rather short of money just now so this is the most I can do. God bless you and your work.

I. T., California

Gentlemen:

The first copy of H.W.D. that I have been privileged to receive has convinced me that some of my friends would appreciate it as much as I if they were to know about it.

Would you kindly send sample copies to the following?

J. H., Oregon

Yes, we are mailing samples to the complete list. Thanks.—Ed.

NOTICE

Just as we go to press we received the official notice from the Secretary of State for the changing the name of the Humanist Fellowship to the Humanist World Fellowship. We believe the word "world" added to the name of our Fellowship better signifies our objective. Appropriate changes will be made in the next issue.

* * *

MANAGING EDITOR'S COLUMN

The many complimentary letters received, especially after the May issue, have been most gratifying. We want to thank the large number of readers who have indicated their sincere interest in the objectives of the Humanist World Digest by the number of names of their friends sent in for sample copies.

This type of reader interest is most encouraging to the editor. So if you are not already a subscriber, and receive a sample copy of the H.W.D. and like its objectives, just fill out the following subscription form, clip a dollar bill to it, and mail it now for a year's subscription.

SUBSCRIPTION FORM

Please enter my subscription to the Humanist World Digest foryears at \$1.00 per year. \$..... enclosed herewith.

Please send information on how to become a member or form a chapter of the Humanist (World) Fellowship.....(Check)

NAME

ADDRESS

(Please type or print)

Add additional names on a separate sheet.

Mail to: **HUMANIST WORLD DIGEST**
1011 Heinz Avenue
Berkeley 2, California

INTERPRETING HUMANIST OBJECTIVES

HUMANIST FELLOWSHIP is a religious association incorporated under the laws of the State of California with all the rights and privileges of such organizations. It enrolls members, charters local societies, affiliates like-minded groups, establishes educational projects and ordains ministers.

HUMANIST FELLOWSHIP defines religions in terms of two inseparable historical processes: (1) the ages-long quest for ultimate human values; and (2) the continuous effort to realize these values in individual experience and in just the harmonious social relations. Humanism affirms the inviolable dignity of the individual and declares democracy the only acceptable method of social progress.

MODERN HUMANISM seeks to unite the whole of mankind in ultimate religious fellowship. It strives for the integration of the whole personality and the perfection of social relationships as the objectives of religious effort. Humanism, in broad terms, tries to achieve a good life in a good world. **HUMANIST FELLOWSHIP** is a shared quest for that good life.

Above all, man is not to be regarded as an instrument that serves and glorifies totalitarianism — economic, political or ecclesiastical.

HUMANIST insists that man is the highest product of the creative process within our knowledge, and as such commands our highest allegiance. He is the center of our concern. He is not to be treated as a means to some other end, but as an end in himself. Heretofore man has been considered a means to further the purposes of gods, states, economic systems, social organizations; but Humanism would reverse this and make all these things subservient to the fullest development of the potentialities of human nature as the supreme end of all endeavor. This is the cornerstone of Humanism, which judges all institutions according to their contribution to human life.

HUMANISM recognizes that all mankind are brothers with a common origin. We are all of one blood with common interests and a common life and should march with mutual purposes toward a common goal. This means that we must eradi-

cate racial antagonisms, national jealousies, class struggles, religious prejudices and individual hatreds. Human solidarity requires that each person consider himself a cooperating part of the whole human race striving toward a commonwealth of man built upon the principles of justice, good will and service.

HUMANISM seeks to understand human experience by means of human inquiry. Despite the claims of revealed religions, all of the real knowledge acquired by the race stems from human inquiry. Humanists investigate facts and experience, verify these, and formulate thought accordingly. However, nothing that is human is foreign to the Humanist. Institutions, speculations, supposed supernatural revelations are all products of some human mind so must be understood and evaluated. The whole body of our culture — art, poetry, literature, music, philosophy and science must be studied and appreciated in order to be understood and appraised.

HUMANISM has no blind faith in the perfectibility of man but assumes that his present condition, as an individual and as a member of society, can be vastly improved. It recognizes the limitations of human nature but insists upon developing man's natural talents to their highest point. It asserts that man's environment, within certain limits, can be arranged so as to enhance his development. Environment should be brought to bear on our society so as to help to produce healthy, sane, creative, happy individuals in a social structure that offers the most opportunity for living a free and full life.

HUMANISM accepts the responsibility for the conditions of human life and relies entirely upon human efforts for their improvement. Man has made his own history and he will create his own future—for good or ill. The Humanist determines to make this world a fit place to live in and human life worth living. This is a hard but challenging task. It could result gloriously.

These brief paragraphs indicate the objectives and methods of **HUMANIST FELLOWSHIP** as a religious association. Upon the basis of such a program it invites all like-minded people into membership and communion. Let us go forward together.



Josiah R. Bartlett
2441 LeConte Ave.
Berkeley 9, Calif. (a)